-	
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
3	SOUTHERN DIVISION
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff, No: 2:22cr25
6	vs.
7	SAMUEL OGOSHI, SAMSON OGOSHI,
8	Defendants.
9	berendantes.
10	Before:
11	THE HONORABLE RAY KENT
12	U.S. Magistrate Judge Grand Rapids, Michigan
13	Friday, September 1, 2023 Detention Hearing Proceedings
14	APPEARANCES:
15	MR. MARK A. TOTTEN, U.S. ATTORNEY
16	By: MR. DANIEL Y. MEKARU MR. DAVIN REUST
17	330 Ionia Avenue, NW P.O. Box 208
18	Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0208 (616) 456-2404
19	On behalf of the Plaintiff;
20	FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
21	By: MR. SEAN TILTON 50 Louis Street, NW, Suite 300
22	Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2633 (616) 742-7420
23	On behalf of Samuel Ogoshi.
24	
25	

```
Willey & Chamberlain LLP
1
                      MS. JULIA ANNE KELLY
                       300 Ottawa Avenue, NW, Suite 810
2
                       Grand Rapids, MI 49503
                       (616) 458-2212
3
                                 On behalf of Samson Ogoshi.
 4
           TRANSCRIBED BY: MR. PAUL G. BRANDELL, CSR-4552, RPR, CRR
5
 6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

09/01/2023

10:56 a.m.

THE CLERK: The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan is now in session. The Honorable Ray Kent, United States Magistrate Judge, presiding.

Samuel and Samson Ogoshi. Mr. Reust, Mr. Mekaru on behalf of the United States. Mr. Tilton on behalf of Samuel. Ms. Kelly on behalf of Samson. We're here for a bond hearing that has been scheduled for each of the Defendants. I have received the United States' detention memo. Appears in the Court's record ECF 41 and the lengthy exhibits attached thereto. I have read and/or reviewed those, including the handwritten statements provided to me here this morning right before we were to begin. I have also read Defendant's motion for bond in Samson's case that would be ECF 36, and in Samuel's case it would be ECF 35.

In addition, I have read the pretrial services reports in Samson's case. That would be ECF 32, and Samuel, ECF 33.

Following the investigation, and granted, the investigation was short, given the geography of the situation, pretrial services is recommending that I order both Samuel and Samson to be detained.

Gentlemen, we are going to have a bond hearing here in a moment. There are two issues at play in a bond hearing. One is risk of nonappearance. The other is danger to the

community. The government has the burden of proof on both of those issues. On the issue of risk of nonappearance, the government's burden is something we call a preponderance of the evidence. That means there is just slightly more evidence suggesting somebody is a risk of nonappearance than evidence to the contrary.

On the other issues, danger to the community, the government's burden is a heavier one, something we call clear and convincing evidence, and requires more evidence by the government.

A couple things about a bond hearing. The rules of evidence that apply in a trial do not apply in a bond hearing. So things like hearsay evidence, which would not be admissible if we were having a trial, are admissible in a bond hearing. In fact, even if the government collected evidence against you illegally, and at this point I have no reason to believe that it did, that evidence would probably come in for our purposes here today.

Moreover, neither the government nor you have to produce evidence by putting witnesses on the witness stand. You can do it instead using a procedure we call a proffer. What that means is the lawyers tell me facts which I then consider as if they had come from a witness on the witness stand.

Are there -- before we get rolling here, are there

preliminary matters that we should take up, Mr. Reust?

MR. REUST: Not from the government's perspective,
Your Honor. Everything the Court just said is the way that the
government would intend to proceed.

THE COURT: Mr. Tilton?

MR. TILTON: Your Honor, I did make an argument in Samuel Ogoshi's pretrial or bond motion requesting that the Court direct the government to produce evidence at least originated in Nigeria, by witness testimony. Under the Stone case the Court has the discretion to allow the parties to proceed by proffer or require testimony. Essentially the basis of our — our argument to require testimony here is because of Nigeria's generally considered to be corrupt criminal justice system. Mr. Ogoshi and his brother were held for a period of time, according to their Nigeria lawyer, that went against Nigeria law.

THE COURT: They were held for months.

MR. TILTON: Correct. Before that they had an attorney. The government produced some written statements from both Defendants today. There were four statements that were produced -- that were attributed to Samuel Ogoshi, three prior to the FBI's interview in Nigeria.

So I think that there are concerns here about the circumstances under which those statements were taken, and the Court does have an obligation to look at both the reliability

and the accuracy of the evidence that the government produces, and the Defendant, whether by proffer or by witness testimony, and so I think that the Court has authority and discretion to consider that the evidence from Nigeria, just based upon its — its originating from Nigeria, and the circumstances of a number of written statements without counsel, that the Court should be concerned and require more information than simply a proffer from the government.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Tilton.

Ms. Kelly, do you wish to be heard on this issue?

MS. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor. Just briefly and specifically in relation to Exhibits 10 and 11 that we received this morning. I -- I would join in Mr. Tilton's objection to proceeding with those exhibits specifically. They are handwritten. In reviewing them it appears that there were two different handwriting, two different authors. I don't know who those were. I don't have any of the circumstances, and I am not going to be able to -- to get more clarification on that. So I would object to -- to those being admitted by proffer only. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Kelly, I'll tell you, I thought -- maybe I am dead wrong, but I was assuming they were written by your clients, but I don't know.

MS. KELLY: I know my client's name is on it. I am

talking about the -- the first paragraph, if the Court would look at it, compared to the other written statements, it appears that there is two different handwriting going on there. So I don't know who that would be, and I don't know how these were taken.

Obviously, this Court has reviewed Samson Ogoshi's statements. The first one given is a complete denial, and then there is another one written out that same day. So I would take issue with those being admitted by proffer only.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. KELLY: Thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

Mr. Reust?

MR. REUST: Thank you, Your Honor.

The first thing I'd note, and the primary thing that I highlight in the government's response by this request by the Defense is that the Defendants speak generally about what they claim are conditions in Nigeria, but they nowhere say that they were forced or coerced to make these statements, and in fact, you know, turning to Exhibits 10 and 11, which admittedly we did just receive this morning as well, which is why we hadn't had the opportunity to give them to Defense counsel or the Court before then, but those statements began with a statement that they are made voluntarily.

Additionally, the law is quite clear that statements

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

made in a foreign country to foreign officials, first, don't have to be Mirandized, and two, can be considered even as substantive evidence at trial in the case, and I can cite several circuit cases to the Court that would indicate that as well.

The other thing that I would point out to the Court is that the statements they make are corroborated by a significant amount of additional evidence. It's not like we are considering those statements that they made in a vacuum. was evidence obtained from their phones when they were in There is significant evidence from the United States and legal process in the United States that corroborates the statements that they made. And the fact is just that those witnesses that would be for the government from Nigeria aren't The entire reason why the rules of evidence don't apply at this proceeding are because we -- this is just not the time to litigate this issue of whether these statements are admissible. The briefing schedule on something like that, which is a dispositive motion, would be months, and will likely be months if the Defendants wish to suppress those statements later on. And they don't want to take that time. for the hearing to be today. So I would ask that the Court do -- does at least consider these statements, give them whatever weight it believes is necessary or appropriate, and just consider them in the context of the other evidence the

United States intends to proffer.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Reust.

Mr. Tilton?

MR. TILTON: May I offer one quick rebuttal, Your

Honor?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TILTON: Your Honor, the -- the Court and the government can proceed using hearsay evidence. I -- I would note that as we -- with concerns with these statements and the conditions that they were taken under, particularly -- well, I would say all statements in Nigeria, whether they were to the FBI or to Nigerian authorities, the FBI sent communications to the Nigerian government to arrest Mr. Ogoshi, both Ogoshis and four other individuals, and at the time of that communication they said that six individuals -- excuse me, that a team of two case agents, investigative analysis, a member of the FBI's computer analysis response team, a supervisory special agent and the Assistant United States Attorney prosecuting the case will all be traveling to Nigeria in January of this year. So I don't think that we are asking that it has to be a Nigerian who was present for all of these statements, but perhaps an FBI agent who traveled on that team to Nigeria and could testify about the conditions the Ogoshis were held in and when they arrived on the date of July -- January 22nd, as to the state that they did. They would have been in Nigeria for both Samson

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ogoshi's arrest and a number of statements made by Samuel Ogoshi. Thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome. I quess it occurs to me that if -- you know, and I have no reason to dispute Mr. Tilton's representations about the Nigerian legal system and the state of affairs in Nigeria, but if a suspect can be coerced into admitting to wrongdoing, he could certainly be coerced into saying that he is giving the statement voluntarily. So I don't find much weight in the fact that in the statement, at least I recall Samuel -- Samuel was voluntary, and that he had been treated well and had been fed and was not being abused. I mean, all of those things could be coerced, and nobody in this room knows -- well, I don't know if nobody. I don't know what pressures may have been brought to bear on either of these Defendants prior to their interviews by the FBI agents or during those -- not accusing the FBI of anything, but in conjunction with those interviews or after those interviews.

Having said that, though, I agree with Mr. Reust that the Defendants' remedy here, if, in fact, there is evidence that the statements were coerced or that there were irregularities under United States law in a way that Samuel and Samson were treated, the remedy is to bring a motion to suppress, or a remedy -- I am not suggesting it's the only remedy, but a remedy would be a motion to suppress the

statements for consideration by the District Judge in this 1 2 case. For purposes of today's hearing, though, I am going to 3 allow the government and the Defendants to proceed by proffer. 4 Anything else we should take up before we get started, 5 Mr. Reust? 6 MR. REUST: Not from the government's perspective. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Tilton? 8 MR. TILTON: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Kelly? 10 11 MS. KELLY: No, Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Reust, the burden of proof 12 13 is on you. The floor is yours. MR. REUST: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 I would just begin by moving to admit Government's 15 Exhibits 1 through 11? I think they are largely in the record 16 and my understanding is that the Defense has no objection to 17 the Court considering them. 18 THE COURT: Objections to the admissions of the 19 exhibits, Mr. Tilton? 20 21 MR. TILTON: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Ms. Kelly? 23 MS. KELLY: No, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: They are admitted. MR. REUST: Thank you, Your Honor. 25

So by way of proffer, on March 25th of 2022, police responded to the home of a 17 year old high school boy who had died from a self-inflicted gunshot wound. That boy is identified as victim 1 in the indictment.

Later that same day, March 25th of 2022, victim 1's girlfriend received a collage of images on her Instagram account from a user with the user name dani.robertts. The collage included nude and clothed images of victim 1. The dani.robertts account told victim 1's girlfriend, quote, cooperate with me, end quote. Victim 1's girlfriend continued to speak with this dani.robertts account for a short period of time. Informed the dani.robertts account that victim 1 had taken his own life, and eventually stopped responding to the account and reported the information to the police.

Using that information police obtained a search warrant for the Instagram account dani.robertts. Exhibit 1 is a copy of the profile photo used for the dani.robertts account. Exhibit 2 is a copy of a conversation between the dani.robertts account and victim 1 on March 24th and 25th of 2022.

The first several pages are introductory conversation and include the dani.robertts account trying to make victim 1 comfortable. In page ID 54 in the record, victim 1 tells dani.robertts that he is 17 years old. On page ID 57, dani.robertts tells victim 1 that she likes, quote, hanging out with friends and playing sexy games, end quote. The

dani.robertts account then aggressively tries to get victim 1 to engage in what it calls, quote, sexy picks, over about the next 15 pages of Exhibit 1.

At page ID 73, dani.robertts got the pictures she wanted and immediately sends this message. Quote, I have screenshot all your followers and tags can send this nudes to everyone and also send your nudes to your family and friends until it goes viral. All you have to do is cooperate with me and I won't expose you.

The dani.robertts account follows that up with, I got all I need RN, which means right now, and then goes onto say, to make your life miserable dude, end quote.

Over about the next 40 minutes the dani.robertts account hounds victim 1 relentlessly. On page 1102 of that exhibit, Exhibit 1, it threatens to release the images following a countdown. Pages 1103 and 1104 it says, quote, just try to act smart with me and I am going to make sure all your family members see this.

Page 1107, watch how I make your life miserable, end quote.

Page ID 128, victim 1 pays \$300, which was the agreed upon amount with the dani.robertts account. On page ID 144, victim 1 is begging for dani.robertts to delete the photo collage after paying the \$300, but dani.robertts asks for more money, now \$800. Victim 1 responds that he doesn't have it.

On page ID 147, dani.robertts begins another countdown from 10 down to 1.

On page ID 150, victim 1 has shown dani.robertts a photo of his bank account with \$55 in it, and offers to pay everything he has. The dani.robertts account responds, quote, no deal, end quote.

On page ID 155, victim 1 pleads with the account. Dani.robertts responds, lol, I love this, end quote.

On page ID 158, the dani.robertts account says, quote, I am going to start trending soon, end quote.

On page ID 162, victim 1 asks, why are you doing this to me? The dani.robertts account responds because, it's going to be your worse night marrow, presumably nightmare, end quote.

On page ID 172, victim 1 says, I am begging for my own life, end quote. On page ID 188, the dani.robertts account starts yet another countdown from 10.

On page ID 193, the dani.robertts account says, quote, I bet your GF will leave you for some other dude, end quote. On page ID 195, the dani.robertts account says, quote, just waiting for your GF to get the text, end quote, and then goes onto say, quote, you know what will happen. Victim 1 responds, I will be dead. Like I want to KMS, end quote. The dani.robertts account responds, sure. I want you to be dead, end quote.

On page ID 198, victim 1 says he can't pay anymore

money, and dani.robertts, the account says, quote, okay, then I will watch you die a miserable death, end quote.

On page ID 201, victim 1 says, quote, it's over. You win bro, end quote. The dani.robertts account responds, quote, okay. Good-bye. Enjoy your miserable life, end quote. Victim 1 responds, I am KMS RN. BC of you, end quote, meaning, I am killing myself right now because of you. The dani.robertts account responds, good. Do that fast.

Page ID 202, the dani.robertts account says, or I'll make you do it, I swear to God, end quote.

FBI analyzed that account, the dani.robertts account, and saw that in a message to someone else the dani.robertts account instructed that person to contact them at their personal account which was a gmail account hofinghammark@gmail.com, FBI obtained the search warrant for that account and it had an e-mail to frostsamuel14@gmail.com with a photo of Samuel Ogoshi, Samson Ogoshi and two other people.

FBI then obtained a search warrant for the frostsamuel14@gmail.com account, and analyzing that account the FBI determined that it appeared to be Samuel Ogoshi's primary e-mail account. In it, the gmail return, there was a note that appeared to be the same or similar to the extortion demand used in the texts to victim 1. That note reads, quote, hey I have screenshot all ur followers and tags and those that comment on

ur post. I can send this nudes to everyone and also send your nudes Until it goes viral....All you've to do is to cooperate with me and I will not expose you, end quote.

The account also -- the same gmail account also contained numerous images of other sextortion victims contacted by the dani.robertts Instagram account, and one of those was the collage sent by -- sent to victim 1. The account also included Google search history and agents found evidence of the searches following victim 1's death. Exhibit 3 is some of those searches that were shown to Samuel Ogoshi during his interview with the FBI in Nigeria.

Page ID 204, there is a search for Michigan suicide.

Page ID 205, there is a search for Instagram blackmail death.

Page ID 206, there is a search for how can FBI track my IP from another country.

There are additional searches in the Google history that were not shown in the Exhibit 3, that include how to hide my IP address without VPN? How your IP address can be traced? How can FBI track my IP from another country, and how to clear your IP address on Instagram? These were all made on April 1st, 2022.

FBI agents identified a list of additional telephone numbers and e-mail addresses that were associated with a dani.robertts Instagram account. Agents subpoenaed Google and Apple requesting any accounts linked to the e-mails and

telephone numbers. One of the phone numbers was used to register an Apple account, specifically a FaceTime account with the Apple ID of ogoshisamsonzero@gmail.com. In the FBI's analysis, this appeared to be Samson Ogoshi's primary e-mail account, and this appeared to be his primary Apple ID account as well. Twelve images -- and it contained 12 images of dani.robertts including the Instagram profile image used for dani.robertts were found in that iCloud account.

Further, there was a screen capture of calls made in Instagram in Samson Ogoshi's iCloud account that shows calls made from the dani.robertts account to who has been identified in the indictment as victim 2. Agents went back to the dani.robertts Instagram return and analyzed the statements to victim 2, and those are Government's Exhibit 4. The first few pages show introduction in trying to make victim 2 feel comfortable.

Page ID 211, the dani.robertts account says, sometimes I play erotic near pic exchange lol, end quote. Eventually the dani.robertts account received a nude photo from victim 2. On page ID 223 to 224, the account then responds, quote, I have screenshot all ur followers and tags and send this nudes to everyone and also send your nudes to your family and friends until it goes viral. All you have to do is cooperate with me and I won't expose you, end quote.

Page ID 225, quote, cooperate with me and I won't

expose u, and then begins a count down at 10. Page ID 228, quote, you are going to regret ever acting smart were me, end quote. Quote, just don't pay me, end quote. And then another quote, MC I am gonna F you up. The F word is included in there, end quote.

Page ID 235, victim 2 indicates he doesn't have the money. And that dani.robertts account responds, enjoy your miserable life dude, end quote.

Paged 238, victim 2 again says he doesn't have the money, and that dani.robertts account responds quote, haha, I love this, end quote.

On paged 240 the dani.robertts account responds, your family are going to regret they ever had you when I am done with you, end quote, and then quote, you choose money over life right now, end quote.

Paged 255, the dani.robertts account says, dude don't play games with me. I am dangerous, end quote. And on page 261 it says, quote, I will make you regret your life. I will make you commit suicide, end quote.

In analyzing Samson Ogoshi's iCloud account agents also found additional nude images of victim 2 and nude images of multiple other boys including at least two other minors.

Those minors were interviewed and acknowledged being sextorted over Instagram in much the same way victim 1 and victim 2 were.

On January 17th, 2023, Samuel Ogoshi was arrested by

the EFCC, and he made statements to Nigerian police. Those states are -- were handwritten and contained in Government's Exhibit 10. At the beginning Samuel Ogoshi says, I am not obligated to say anything unless I wish to do so, but whatever I say shall be taken down in writing and may be given in evidence. I freely would like to state thus follows. I have been informed of my right to my lawyer before making these statements, but in the absence of my lawyer I wish to continue with the making of my voluntary statement.

It goes onto say later on the bottom of that page, I started on-line romance dating scam in the year 2022 January. I do my on-line romance scan by creating an Instagram profile with a foreign girl's name and download good profile pictures of foreign girls on Instagram and use the Instagram profile to follow boys having used my downloaded picture as my profile picture on Instagram. Then I text them on Instagram and ask them to exchange nudes with me. I send them downloaded nudes which is not mine, and I ask for their own nudes, which they will send to me. After collecting their nudes I now proceed to blackmail them.

On January 24th, Samson -- of 2023, Samson Ogoshi was arrested by Nigeria -- in Nigeria, I'm sorry, by the EFCC. Exhibit 11 is a copy of Samson's handwritten statement. It begins, quote, I have -- I, Samson Ogoshi, having been duly cautioned in English language that I am not obligated to say

anything unless I wish to do so, but whatever I say shall be taken down in writing and may be given in evidence, I freely and voluntary wish to state as follows.

It goes on with the third page of this exhibit to say my brother, Samuel Ogoshi, taught me Internet frauding for some months ago. Blackmailing is the only type of Internet fraud I do. I do blackmailing by first getting Instagram account, edit it to name -- to look like a U.S.A. citizen and upload a female picture as the profile.

Then it says, first of all -- it's handwritten, so somewhat difficult to read. Chat and ask them if they want to exchange nudes. They exchange each other and blackmail them for money. By nudes I mean naked picture. I cannot remember the number of people that I blackmail.

On February 8th of 2023, FBI agents traveled to Nigeria and interviewed Samuel Ogoshi and Samson Ogoshi and the reports of those interviews are contained in Exhibit 7 as well as the waivers that they were given acknowledging that they understood they have the right to an attorney, didn't have to speak to the agents regardless of what they had done before.

During that interview Samuel Ogoshi stated he purchased the Instagram accounts that were used for blackmail. He targeted men and boys pretending to be college-aged girls. He solicited nude photos from victims, put those photos in collages and extorted his victims for money. He created the

account with the name dani.robertts. He claimed that he and Ezekiel Robert, which is the third Defendant in the indictment, worked together in the extortion of victim 1, but notably as an aside, the FBI analysis of the dani.robertts account, all the associated devices with the investigation, and the other gmail and iCloud accounts associated with the investigation, indicate that Samuel was the one controlling the dani.robertts account at the time of victim 1's death.

Samuel Ogoshi also stated that he learned after victim 1's death and told Samson Ogoshi about it. Samuel Ogoshi stated that after learning of victim 1's death he stopped engaging in extortion for a period of time but then he returned to doing it again.

When Samuel Ogoshi was originally arrested the EFCC had seized his phone and agents analyzed that phone and at the time of arrest it contained additional sextortion images and collages that appeared to have been created shortly before his arrest and leading up to his arrest.

FBI also interviewed Samson Ogoshi that day, and the report of that interview is Exhibit 8. It contains the same waiver and the advice of rights that were given to Samuel Ogoshi.

Samson told police that he had been involved in the fraud for about a year. He said that Samuel bought Instagram accounts and that he then used. He described -- described the

scheme as using the image of a female porn star and then contacting men and boys to get them to send nude images and then demanding money. He stated that he made good money from his blackmail. He stated he was shown images of nude males from his account. He said he didn't recognize them but that if they were in his account that he was involved in their blackmail.

He stated that he had learned of victim 1's death from Samuel and that he had also had stopped engaging in sextortion for a short while but then resumed.

The EFCC had also seized Samson Ogoshi's phone when he was arrested, and an analysis of that phone indicated that it had continued to engage in sextortion because there were additional collages and images that appeared to have been created shortly before his arrest.

On August 12th and 13th of 2023, FBI agents transported Samuel and Samson Ogoshi both from Nigeria to Grand Rapids, Michigan. In doing so the Department of Homeland Security Immigration and Customs Enforcement or ICE, placed detainers on both Samuel Ogoshi and Samson Ogoshi. Exhibit 5 is a copy of the detainer for Samuel and Exhibit 6 is a copy of the detainer for Samson.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement Assistant Field
Officer Director Todd Osborne has provided an affidavit that if
the Defendants were released on bond ICE would detain them and

begin deportation proceedings. That is recorded in Director Osborne's declaration, which is Government's Exhibit 9.

I also spoke to U.S. Probation Officer Thomas Mize, who informed me that if the Defendants were given pretrial release to a local facility it would likely be the Alternative Directions facility. He spoke with the director of that facility who indicated that it allows residents to have access to Internet capable phones in common areas and in their rooms. Officer Mize also confirmed that to his knowledge every facility that's available to the probation office that houses pretrial releasees has those same allowances.

That is all the information that I have to proffer at this time, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Tilton, Ms. Kelly?

MR. TILTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I am going to start by proffering background information about Samuel Ogoshi. The information is contained in both the pretrial services report and in the -- Mr. Samuel Ogoshi's motion and brief for pretrial release.

The information was provided either by Mr. Ogoshi directly to the pretrial services officer or it was provided directly to me and my investigator by Samuel Ogoshi's brother, mother and attorney, and that is Samuel Ogoshi is a 22 year old college student in his second year at Nasarawa State University in Nigeria studying sociology.

He is a native of Nigeria. Has never left the country until his extradition in this case. He does not have a passport. He does not have any prior arrests or convictions, which is also corroborated by the government's initial pretrial statement which lists no criminal history for Mr. Ogoshi.

He doesn't -- he has never been to jail prior to this arrest, and he relies on his parents for financial support and does not have any assets. His family is middle class in Nigeria, which would not support their -- their income there would not support a middle class life-style here or the assets to provide to him to flee to Nigeria. Mr. Ogoshi's father is a retired member of the Nigerian military. He receives a pension. His mother owns a small business selling soft drinks out of their apartment to their neighbors.

Mr. Ogoshi's entire family has never traveled outside of Nigeria and does not have passports. They all live within Lagos, Nigeria, or the Nasarawa State, which is kind of in Central Nigeria.

Mr. Ogoshi has never used illicit drugs. He has not used alcohol in years, and he is in good physical health and not -- does not have any mental health issues. He and his family are christians. They attend a local church in Lagos three times per week and he has attended that church for his entire life.

His family is tight knit. We have been in close

contact with his brother in particular, who has been the spokesperson for his family, but he is also close to his parents as well. His family remains supportive of him, as does his -- well, his family remains supportive.

We are -- and as stated in our brief, we are seeking release to a halfway house if he were released. The Court would be obligated to impose the specific conditions under the Adam Walsh Act, and we have no objection to additional conditions as the Court sees necessary, including that he not be allowed to possess a cell phone or access to the Internet.

That's the category of information about Mr. Ogoshi himself. As far as information about where he might spend his time, I also spoke to the pretrial services department about where he might be placed. We would be specifically requesting Alternative Directions, but it would -- have no objection if the Court placed Mr. Ogoshi in a different facility. But I did talk to U.S. Probation Officer Ben Schultz, who is here in court today. He provided me with information about Alternative Directions and also provided me their current cell phone policy.

What he did state, as the Court -- as I think the Court is well aware, the Court could impose a condition that Mr. Ogoshi not have Internet access or not have a phone while on bond, and that condition could be monitored by Alternative Directions.

Mr. Ogoshi would have a case manager at Alternative Directions. At least one of the current case managers there is a former United States Probation Officer. That case manager would know his bond conditions, and his bond conditions could be conveyed to other staff within Alternative Directions.

Alternative Directions does have a cell phone policy that says that all probations and parole stipulations still apply, i.e., phone restrictions, to contact orders, et cetera. So I am not sure if I completely understood the government's argument about the ability of probation or pretrial services to restrict cell phone use through conditions of bond, but to the extent that the Court imposes a condition that he cannot have Internet access or cell phone use, Alternative Directions would be able to honor that condition.

Additionally, I have some case information about other cases where the government has not opposed bond in an extortion case, and then a child pornography case. I think that information I provided to the government is probably better left for argument, but I can go into that information now if the Court wants to hear it.

THE COURT: No. You can wait for argument.

MR. TILTON: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kelly, before I hear from you,

Mr. Reust, can't I impose a condition that the Defendants not
have phones at AD?

MR. REUST: You can impose that condition, Your Honor. As the government states in its brief, the Court then basically has to hope that that is followed by the Defendants, and these are Defendants that learned about, you know, a child taking his own life because of their blackmail and continued to do it.

Additionally, I would just say even in Alternative Directions, at any pretrial release facility there is no way for the facility administrators to watch the Defendants 100 percent of the time.

And last, something I don't raise in the brief but that I thought about some since writing it, is I think there is a serious risk just that the Defendants pose of blackmailing the other releasees or other people at these facilities. These are the Defendants who disregarded the life and the loss of life of a young child, and they did this because they wanted money very bad. There is no reason to believe that they would not be willing to extort other releasees to obtain money that they would otherwise have no way to obtain.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Reust.

Ms. Kelly?

MS. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'll try not to duplicate all the information that Mr. Tilton just provided by the Ogoshi family.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: But with respect to Samson Ogoshi I'll

also rely on the pretrial services report that was written. Submitted an Exhibit A that was a documentation that Simian Ogoshi provided in regards to Samson's educational record. I also would note that Simian Ogoshi is -- has joined the Court here in watching the proceedings from Nigeria as a supportive family member.

Samson Ogoshi is 20 years old. He also has no prior criminal history. No run-ins with any sort of legal issues. He did graduate from secondary school and was preliminarily accepted into the same college that Samuel was attending. Simian also attended that same college and graduated with honors.

Samson has never traveled outside of Nigeria. No one in the family has traveled outside of Nigeria. Samson has no relatives in the United States. Samson has no reported health issues, no mental health issues, no children, and has never used any controlled substances. He also is a member of the church that the family goes to, and has been a dutiful son to his family. He was living at home at the time of his brother's arrest.

Samson also was told to report to the EFCC. I am getting additional information that that was on January the 24th. Samson did appear at the EFCC as told, and apparently participated in investigations and statements there.

Samson has not had any disciplinary issues since his

arrest.

Getting to the point that Mr. Reust just brought up, he has had the opportunity now for nine months to do some sort of extortion and he hasn't, so I don't think that that would change.

He has no income or financial support, has no passport, no travel document. He has no way to -- to get out of the country. His family also do not own passports so they have no way to get into the country.

I am also, on behalf of Samson, requesting this Court to release him to a halfway house. I think that would be appropriate with any other conditions that this Court would want to add, including a tether, including no contact on a cell phone, and — and not having that access to the cell phone. I think that is easily monitored by Alternative Directions. I certainly have been present for supervised release violations where someone has access to a phone and they shouldn't at Alternative Directions. So certainly I think that that is something they can monitor closely. And with that, I will submit and then save my argument.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. KELLY: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Reust, argument?

MR. REUST: Your Honor, the Defense in this case evidenced a complete disregard for human life, in this case,

specifically the life of a 17 year old boy. They learned about his death. We know not only from what they told police but also from Samuel Ogoshi's search history where he is Googling and trying to find out more information about that, and we know that after they learned about the victim 1's death they continued to engage in the exact same kind of activity that led to victim 1's death. They went back to sextorting men and young boys so that they could obtain more money.

Yes. The Defendants argue that their goal here was to obtain money, but to get that money they were willing to go to any -- any extreme necessary to get it, and there are simply no conditions that the Court could place at Alternative Directions or any other facility that would protect the community here in West Michigan from the danger that they pose. They knew about this death and continued to engage in the exact same kind of conduct.

Additionally, the thing that Ms. Kelly stated at the end of her proffer just confirms that Alternative Directions just simply doesn't have any way to make sure that the people that are there never get access to a phone. There are violations of that policy and Alternative Directions has to respond to that. I think all of us have been present for supervised release violations and different things where that has been a case and -- and an allegation. So there is simply no condition the Court could place that would keep them from

getting access to those devices.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And with the device, with an electronic device that are Internet capable, these Defendants could engage in the same exact same kind of sextortion that they engaged in before.

There is no reason to believe that they wouldn't or that they couldn't. All it would require is an Instagram account, which isn't difficult for them to get and to use.

Additionally, Your Honor, I think every factor that the Court is supposed to consider -- consider under 3142 also indicates that the Defendants pose a serious risk of nonappearance. Both of the proffers that we just heard from -about both Samuel and Samson indicate that they have no ties to this community. They have no family in this community. Yes, they have no money, but -- and they don't have the ability necessarily to get back to Nigeria, but they have every reason, knowing that they are facing, in Samuel's case, potential mandatory minimum sentence of 30 years, and in Samson's case a potential mandatory minimum sentence of 15 years, they have every reason to flee and to just disappear, being free somewhere in the United States where they could return to blackmail. Obviously, they couldn't have real employment because they don't have papers. Free to blackmail and to make money and to not be in custody.

So Your Honor, in the United States position these Defendants both pose a serious danger because of the complete

disregard that they had for the life of a boy in West Michigan that took his own life, and continuing to engage in that conduct, and they pose a significant risk of nonappearance for the very reason that they can have absolutely no ties to Western Michigan. They are not here because they wanted to be. They are here so that they can face trial, so that they can face the accusations that have been brought against them. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

Mr. Tilton?

MR. TILTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I think it's important to -- to start with the standard here that the Court must evaluate whether or not to -- to grant release, because I think in the government's argument it was applying a higher standard than -- than actually applies. The statute says the judicial officer shall order the pretrial release of the person subject to the least restrictive further condition or combination of conditions that such judicial officer will reasonably assure -- or excuse me, judicial officer determines will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person in the community.

So the standard here isn't whether Alternative

Directions has always been able to prevent every single person

from possessing a cell phone. The standard is whether the

condition will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person in the community.

While this is a presumption case, the burden of persuasion remains with the government, and I think here the presumption is easily rebutted. As the Court is aware, it's a relatively light burden. Mr. Ogoshi has no prior arrest or convictions. He is in his second year of college. He has ties to his local community and a history of being involved in his local church. He cannot flee. He doesn't have the documents to flee. He doesn't have the money. He doesn't have any contacts in the United States or family that would be able to assist him in fleeing.

I think that this is also a complicated offense, so when we move into the 3142(g) factors, and we start to talk about the nature and the circumstances of this offense, I don't think the government is appropriately characterizing how it alleged that this offense occurred. It's not a simple offense that occurred simply with a phone and an Instagram account. The government alleged that six -- six individuals were involved. One individual had to go and hack the social media accounts. That individual would then sell the social media accounts. The government alleges that Samuel, Samson and others purchased those accounts. Then there is alleged to be someone who provided financial support to all the people

involved here.

It wasn't as simple as the government alleges that someone pay this extortion money and it goes right into Ogoshi's bank account. The government alleges that there was an individual in the United States who had to receive the money, send it to this middleman person who the government has identified to the Nigerian authorities. We -- we identified that person based on government records as FE in our brief. That person had to convert the money to cryptocurrency and then eventually converted it to Nigerian currency. So this isn't an offense where someone can go out and simply get a phone and immediately commit an offense in the way the government alleges that it was committed here.

There is no indication, based upon the record, that any of the Defendants here were blackmailing people in person as the government alleges that Mr. Ogoshi could do at the halfway house. I am not really sure what and the means of that blackmail would be and how Mr. Reust believes that -- that Samuel Ogoshi would go out and do that at the halfway house, but there is no indication on the record of any similar activity in the past.

I think that when we look at the nature of this offense under 3142(g)(1), I think the Court should also consider that as far as the penalty enhancement is here, it's sort of a novel theory about the government. Mr. Mekaru said

at the initial appearance that he was not aware of anyone being punished previously under this theory where -- where the alleged victim committed suicide, and so I think that Mr. Ogoshi does have reason to stick around and participate in his trial.

Additionally, this is an -- ultimately a financial offense. The Court took issue at the last hearing with the government's characterization of it as a sextortion case, because ultimately it's an extortion case. It's a case that's alleged to be -- was committed for money, and it's different from cases under the same statute where the offense was alleged to be committed for sexual gratification, because I think those types of Defendants have a higher rate of recidivism or would be more likely to recidivate than Defendants in this situation.

And I would just note that in a similar case where the government alleged that there were 270 victims in this district of sextortion that was committed for sexual gratification, in that case, the government, on its own motion, made a bond that -- made a motion to release the person on an appearance bond, and that was the Brandon Le case that Judge Jonker just sentenced last week. So I don't think that the nature of this offense on its own suggests that there needs to be pretrial detention.

I think when we look at the weight of the evidence against the person where the weight goes to dangerousness, not

the weight of his guilt, I think that signs point that

Mr. Ogoshi is unlikely to engage in criminal conduct while on

bond. It's a complicated case. He won't have the means of

committing the offense while in a halfway house. The halfway

house can observe his conduct, can watch him and can reasonably

assure that he will not possess a cell phone there. Again, he

won't have the financial means to purchase one and he wouldn't

have the means to commit the offense.

Mr. Ogoshi's history and characteristics, while are not tied to this country, I think suggest that he is a person who has been a person of character, and that I don't think that the fact that those ties are to Nigeria should weigh against him here, because they show that he is someone who can't -- well, let me put it this way. It's not -- it's not like he can flee back to Nigeria to escape prosecution here. He is in a foreign country that he has never visited before. The government and the Court can monitor him by placing him at a halfway house and on location monitoring so they'll know where he is at all times. If he were to cut off that location monitoring, probation would know, and I don't think he would get very far. So I don't think the risk of nonappearance on his own volition is high here.

The government and -- and obviously we take issue with what role an ICE detainer plays here. I don't think that there is binding authority on the Court in how to weigh or to

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consider whether or not to consider that ICE detainer, but I do think that there are a number of cases, including the cases in the Sixth Circuit that say the Bail Reform Act and immigration operate separately and the statutes that govern them are separate statutes and operate independently.

I do think it's -- it's worthwhile noting that the government cited the United States v Valadez-Lara case in its brief for the proposition that the Court should consider the ICE detainer in determining Mr. Ogoshi's risk of nonappearance. However, I -- I think the -- the reliance on Valadez-Lara is actually favorable to the Defense there, because the Court there held that, well, while it may be a factor for consideration that other courts have cautioned that the existence of an ICE detainer does not allow the Court to speculate on the eventual results of immigration proceedings, and the Court then held, therefore, when considering Defendant's eligibility for release, the Court will assess whether an immigration detainer could at -- sorry. The Court will assess defendant's intentional risk of nonappearance and not whether an immigration detainer could at some point in the future result in his removal. So in Valadez-Lara case, the court actually only considered intentional risk of non-appearance, which is what we think the Court should consider here.

And I think I am going to say one -- or quote one

other case, which is a district court in the Northern District of Ohio, citing another case out of Minnesota, and that's the United States v Arnodo-Mercado. The Westlaw cite is 2023, Westlaw 2633543, and it said, this Court and many others have long declined to use the government's own decision to remove an alien during the pendency of his criminal prosecution to preclude release.

The problem here is not that the Defendant will absent himself from the jurisdiction, but the two Article II agencies will not coordinate their responsive efforts. This Court ought not to run interference for the prosecuting arm of the government. Put another way, the fact that ICE will not agree or cannot be trusted to delay deportation, that separate agencies within the executive branch do not communicate and cooperate cannot serve to deprive a Defendant his rights under the Eighth Amendment and the Bail Reform Act.

So I would ask the Court to consider that authority and not consider the immigration detainer or Mr. Ogoshi's immigration status in making a decision under the independent Bail Reform Act.

I think looking at all of the factors that the Court must consider under 18 United States Code 3142, I think he has rebutted the presumption. I think that 34 -- 3142(g) factors favor in -- weigh in favor of release, and we would ask for release to a halfway house under conditions required by the

Adam Walsh Act and condition that he not be allowed to possess a phone or access the Internet or any other conditions the Court deems appropriate.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Tilton.

Ms. Kelly?

MS. KELLY: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor. And again, I'll try not to duplicate the efforts from Mr. Tilton.

In order to rebut the presumption Mr. Samson Ogoshi needs to produce some evidence that he will not flee or endanger the community if released. I have talked about -- in my proffer about the issue about fleeing. I think the fact that Samson turned himself in voluntarily, he was not arrested, he went to the EFCC knowing that his brother had been arrested a week prior on the allegations, willingly talked, apparently, with the EFCC and the FBI, I think there are conditions that this Court could place on him, including the halfway house, including a location monitoring, to ensure that he is not able to flee.

Obviously, I have talked about he has no documents to travel. He has no money to travel. He has no access to travel, nor does his family have that money or access to do so.

Samson has no prior arrests or convictions. He has completed secondary school, which would be high school here. He has had some apprenticeships, had some skills, and was accepted into college.

In relation to the endangering the community if released, again, Mr. Samson Ogoshi and Samuel Ogoshi have now been in custody since January, have had no incidents with other members of those that are in detention. No issues related to me from any of the arresting agencies that Samson has had any problems.

The government, in their brief, talked a bit about the allegations and related -- in relation to Samson. Samson is not charged in Count 1, as this Court knows, but the government proposes that Samson on the same date of 3-25 to 3-6 also mentioned, I am going to make you commit suicide. And I just wanted to -- to note for the Court, as the -- the government has stated in their brief, the alleged search of the Michigan suicide, that was on April the 1st. So you have these two conversations that are allegedly going on on the dani.robertts account on the same day.

Samson was asked by the authorities, both by EFCC and by the FBI, which is in the exhibit, did he ever say, did you commit suicide? Samson was shown text messages from the FBI, which is in the exhibit of his interview, and he said on the recording, it's not in the report, on the recording he said, I didn't text that.

Now, I have not looked at all the discovery. The government has allowed us to come over and -- and review some of it. I am sure that if there was some statement that Samson

made after April the 1st about committing suicide or using language like that, I am sure it would have been in an exhibit here in front of the Court.

Mr. Reust talked about there was someone communicating with a girlfriend. Again, I don't have those text messages. I don't know those dates. The earliest date that I have is the date provided by the government, which would be April the 1st, which is when the searches take place. So I don't have anything after that that's related to Samson and those statements like that.

Also, in Exhibit 8, Samson told the FBI agents allegedly that they -- they were targeting colleges and universities in the United States. Not high schools, not middle schools, but searching for colleges and universities, talking about programs and studies that they were doing in college, not looking for minors. And I know Mr. Reust has said that there were additional photos of minors. I don't have that discovery yet.

When Samson was interviewed by the FBI in February, again, without a lawyer present, so this would have been the fourth time that he was interviewed without a lawyer present, when he is reviewing that advice of rights form, which is submitted to this Court as an exhibit, Samson, two minutes into the interview, says, but maybe some few questions if I can't — I am not able to answer I'll need to get advice from my

lawyer -- or a lawyer. Excuse me. And then he was interviewed for another hour and-a-half by FBI agents.

Samson also talked about Forex exchanging that he was doing with FBI agents, other work that he was doing, instead of continuing to allegedly commit this crime. But when, again, asked by the agents if he sent those messages on March the 25th into the 26th to victim 2, who is 21 years old, he adamantly said no.

I agree with Mr. Tilton that this is a complicated case. It is not as simple as Mr. Samson Ogoshi sending a message and receiving the money right back. As Mr. Tilton mentioned, there were, at the request of the FBI, six people that were to be arrested in January of this year that were related. Others that were in charge of getting the hacked accounts. Others that were charged of the finances. There is a portion in these statements where Mr. Samson Ogoshi talks about receiving a portion of -- for what he did.

But with relation to the danger to the community, I think Samson has shown that he can be trusted. That he is not a danger to the community in West Michigan. He will not have access to a phone. He has no access to money or finances. I agree with Mr. Tilton that the -- the Bail Reform Act does not permit pretrial detention just based on an ICE detainer. I would note that in the Fifth Circuit in the United States versus Baltazar-Sebastian, which is 990 F.3d 939, it is a 2021

case under 8 CFR § 215(a)(2) an alien shall not depart the United States if her departure would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States. As a party to a pending criminal case an alien's departure is deemed prejudicial. 8 CFR section 215.3(g). The departure is not prejudicial, however, if the appropriate prosecuting authority provides consent. I would not expect the prosecuting authority here to provide consent that Mr. Samson Ogoshi or Samuel Ogoshi be deported pending these judicial proceedings.

I think the 3142(g) factors do -- would weigh in favor of Samson Ogoshi. He acknowledges the charged offense is serious, but again, the purpose of the alleged conspiracy is for financial gain. He has no prior criminal history. He voluntarily surrendered to the authorities. He has been in custody since January without incident. No history of controlled substance use or possession. Twenty years old. He will be 21 in November. Soon to be a college student. No prior criminal history. He has some work experience. He understands that he will be subject to certain terms and conditions if released by this Court, including a tether, including location monitoring, including no phone, and we would be asking for that release. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Kelly.

Mr. Reust, some very brief rebuttal argument?

MR. REUST: Yes, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I want to -- I'll go briefly through things as they were presented. I think both counsel spoke about how this was a complicated scheme, and, you know, parts of this scheme were indeed complicated, but the part that was blackmail is the part that matters here, and it's the part that both Defendants know how to do and did and returned to after learning about victim 1's death.

Samuel's counsel refers to the ties to the Nigerian community as being irrelevant, but the statute asks about the length of residence in the community being the community of prosecution. It's not asking about the -- the length of time that somebody has lived in a community in a foreign country. So the focus should be on the ties to West Michigan. That's what gives somebody an incentive not to leave West Michigan and to appear for hearings in West Michigan, not the ties that they might have to Nigeria.

Both counsel speak about an ICE detainer alone not being enough, and, you know, I might agree with that. That's not the primary reason why the government believes that these Defendants are a risk of nonappearance. But in addition to that, there is more than an ICE detainer here. There is Exhibit 9, which is the affidavit from the person that would be responsible for enforcing this, and who is saying that if they were released, in fact, not only is there a detainer but they would be placed in custody, and -- ICE custody, and they would

be deported. And I'd note, you know, as I do in the brief, that it's not just ICE saying that that's what should happen here. It's Congress that said it in the relevant statutes as well. Congress has said, not just the executive government or the executive branch of the government, that these Defendants should not be release and if they are they should be detained and deported.

And then Ms. Kelly, you know, acknowledges or states that Samson said he self-reported or that he did self-report to police, the EFCC, but her brief further states that he did that at least because he was told that the police would let both him and Samuel go if he did. It's not unusual for police even in the U.S., you know, to create some kind of a Ruse to get someone to self-report like that, and those were the conditions under which Samuel reported there.

I just return to the fact that the Defendants in this case have shown that they are a danger to this community. They showed that after they did that they returned to the same kind of activity they had been engaged in that led to the problems that they caused in this community, and there are no conditions that this Court can place on them that will reasonably assure their appearance and that will keep this community safe, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Reust.

The Court's consideration of bond begins with the

Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which prohibits excessive bail. The Eighth Amendment's protections are made statute in the Bail Reform Act beginning at 18 United States Code § 18 United States Code § 3141, § 3142 of which requires the Court to release a Defendant on bond unless the Court concludes that there is no condition or combination of conditions that will reasonably ensure the Defendant's appearance and the safety of the community. Certain federal crimes give rise to a presumption in favor of detention. This is one of them.

§ 3142(g) of the act lays out the specific factors that I am to consider in reaching my decision. Those include the nature and circumstances of the offense, specifically whether it involves a crime of violence, which this offense is classified as, am I not right, Mr. Reust?

MR. REUST: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The weight of the evidence against the Defendants is the second factor. I would say that there is substantial evidence against both Defendants. There may be questions about how that -- some of that evidence was collected, but at the end of the day, this factor is accorded the least weight in my analysis for bond because both Defendants are still cloaked with the presumption of innocence.

The -- the weight of the evidence is also more difficult for me to assess here because the government is

pursuing a novel application of the facts of this case to the statute. So we don't have -- I, at least, don't have any way to assess the likelihood of success as the case moves forward, I mean, based upon case law. Other factors, the history and characteristics of the Defendant, including character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, resources, education.

As Mr. Tilton and Ms. Kelly have covered in detail, so I am not going to go through it in the same detail they did, both of these Defendants were born and raised in Nigeria -- Nigeria in Lagos. Both have essentially lived with their mom and dad their entire lives. The parents, married for a long time. Dad retired from the Nigerian military. Mom runs an -- essentially a food cart selling soft drinks in her neighborhood to support the family.

The family is close. They are religious, go to church three times a week. It was a good environment. Both of these Defendants were good students, did well in high school. Both accepted into college.

And I would note for the record that the government, in some of its briefing, refers to the victim in this case as a boy, which he was, but the Defendants are a little more than boys themselves, and terrible and tragic decisions were made in this case, and at the end of the day at what seems likely to me is that two families are going to be destroyed as a result of

the events underlying this case, and that is very sad.

Let's see, as to Samuel, he is 23 now. As Mr. Tilton laid out, single, doesn't have any children, no criminal record, has never been arrested, never been in trouble as far as we know for anything. Doesn't have a passport. Has never traveled outside of Nigeria. In fact, no member of his family has ever traveled outside of Nigeria. As a student, doesn't have any income expenses, assets or liability. Liabilities, he is completely financially reliant on his parents.

His physical health is good. Mental health good.

Samson's story much the same. Obviously raised in the same household with his two brothers. Lives -- lived with his parents his whole life. He is 20 now. Also single, no kids, no passport, never traveled outside Nigeria, no employment history. Was training to be a shoe cobbler. No assets, liabilities, income or expenses.

Physical health is good. Mental health good. He reports that he drank alcohol one time. Also no criminal history. No arrests.

Other factors that I consider in reaching my decision,
I would include the ICE detainer among those. I am not
persuaded by the government's argument with respect to the ICE
detainer. The government, and I don't know if it's Agent
Osborne. Let me pull up his -- Assistant Field Director
Osborne, in his declaration, argues, or says, attests to the

fact that these Defendants would be removed if I released them.

In its sentencing, or in its bond memorandum, oops, the government argues and Mr. Reust argued from the podium a moment ago that Congress has directed ICE to detain and deport Defendants if they are released on bond. To that I would say this. Congress also enacted the Bail Reform Act, which includes a presumption of release. Congress enacted the statute under which you charged these Defendants. Congress provided for the enhanced penalty scheme that you are seeking to enforce here apparently for the first time. If there is a problem in that system, it's Congress that needs to fix it. Not the Court. I am not taking a side. When the government is arguing essentially against itself, two branches of the executive branch have a disagreement, it's Congress's to fix. So the existence of the ICE detainer will play no role in my decision and I give it no weight.

Let's look, then, at the two issues at play here. First, a danger to the community. As I said earlier, the government's burden of proof on that issue is clear and convincing evidence. A fairly heavy standard in the law.

I am equally unpersuaded by the government's arguments that these Defendants pose a danger to the community in that the government would have me believe if I release them they are likely to continue in the same behavior that brings them before the Court today. I would say as a general matter it is

extremely unusual for a Defendant released on bond to continue with the offense conduct that resulted in the charges in the first place. There are exceptions. Drug sales being probably the one I see most often. But these two Defendants are plucked from Lagos, Nigeria, flown half way around the world, separated from their families, and landed here in Grand Rapids, Michigan, which must seem like the far side of the moon to them.

They are facing potential life in prison. Potential long mandatory minimum sentences. Their lives up to the time they became involved in this scheme seemed to have been rule following lives. We have no evidence, no information to suggest -- you know, there is no history of long supervision by juvenile authorities in Nigeria or anything which would lead me to believe that they are not able to follow orders given them directly.

So -- and they also don't seem to me to be unintelligent. I think they appreciate the gravity of their situation. That's been my impression of them when I have had them in Court in front of me.

And so I find the government has not met its burden and it would be difficult, since the only reason we're here is because the victim died, which is tragic, but if the victim hadn't died my guess is we wouldn't be sitting in this courtroom and these charges wouldn't have been brought.

The amount of money involved in the whole -- if we

look at the whole scheme, is minimal. I doubt the United States would have -- would have spent time and money pursuing it otherwise.

So it's the tragic death of victim 1 that brings us here. I don't -- I am not persuaded that these Defendants would do anything like this again.

Moving onto risk of nonappearance. The Defendants argue, you know, based upon their histories in Nigeria, that, and some of the same factors that I have just laid out, that they aren't a danger of nonappearance. This is the more troubling issue for me, because they are basically boys, and they are halfway around the world separated from their families, facing tremendous penalties if ultimately convicted in this case. They know no one here. They have no way to support themselves. They aren't -- would not be allowed to work in any lawful occupation in this country anyway. They have no support system.

The halfway houses -- there are problems at the halfway houses. Those of us who work with them regularly know that. I don't know that for these two Defendants Alternative Directions, CAP or KPEP or any of those places would be safe or appropriate for them.

And I can see, as young men, boys, panic as we get down the trail in this case, flight, which ultimately would prove futile, because nobody escapes the United States. When

it commits its will to finding a person, a person gets found and brought back, but I could see that happening, and when things like that occur, there are all kinds of consequences which can follow, and I don't want to see any of those kinds of consequences come to pass. There has been enough tragedy in this case.

It's my finding, based on all the evidence, that the government has met its burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that these Defendants are a risk of nonappearance in the case and for that reason I am ordering them held in custody while the case is pending.

Mr. Reust, anything else from the United States?

MR. REUST: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Tilton?

MR. TILTON: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Kelly?

MS. KELLY: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: We'll be adjourned.

(Proceeding concluded, 12:17 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a transcript from the Liberty Court Recording System digital recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability.

/s/

Paul G. Brandell, CSR-4552, RPR, CRR

U.S. District Court Reporter

399 Federal Building

Grand Rapids, MI 49503